

# SERIES “MANAGEMENT, ECONOMIC ENGINEERING IN AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT”

*by* Ni Made Ayu Gemuh Rasa Astiti

---

**Submission date:** 27-Nov-2019 12:22PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1222664840

**File name:** Bu\_Gemuh.pdf (306.74K)

**Word count:** 4665

**Character count:** 27695

**Volume 19, Issue 3/2019**

**PRINT ISSN 2284-7995**

**E-ISSN 2285-3952**



# **SCIENTIFIC PAPERS**

**SERIES “MANAGEMENT, ECONOMIC  
ENGINEERING IN AGRICULTURE AND RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT”**

Scientific Papers Series "Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development"  
PRINT ISSN 2284-7995, E-ISSN 2285-3952

Volume 19, Issue 3/2019  
Copyright 2019

To be cited: Scientific Papers Series "Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development", Volume 19, Issue 3/2019.

**Publishers:**

University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania. Address: 59 Marasti Blvd., District 1, 011464 Bucharest, Romania, Phone: +40213182564, Fax: +40213182888, www.managusaamv.ro  
Ceres Publishing House, Address: 29 Oastei Street, District 1, Bucharest, 013701, Phone/Fax: +40213179023, Email: edituraceres@yahoo.com  
All rights reserved

The publishers are not responsible for the content of the scientific papers and opinions published in the Volume. They represent the authors' point of view.

**EDITORIAL BOARD**

Editor in Chief: Prof. Ph.D. Toma Adrian DINU

Executive Editor: Prof. Ph.D. Agatha POPESCU

**Members:**

Prof. Ph.D. H.C. Miguel Moreno MILLAN, University of Cordoba, Spain  
Prof. Ph.D. Jørgen Svend RASMUSSEN, University of Copenhagen, Denmark  
Prof. Ph.D. Mogens LUND, Institute of Food and Resource Economics, Copenhagen, Denmark  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Ove MADSEN, Grinsted Agricultural Academy, Denmark  
Prof. Ph.D. Pascal Anton OLTENACU, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, United States of America  
Prof. Ph.D. Rangesan NARAYANAN, University of Nevada, Reno, United States of America  
Ph.D. Patrik ANGEL, US Department of the Interior, Office of Surface Mining Appalachian Regional Office, U.S.A.  
Prof. Ph.D. Gerhard MOITZI, University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Vienna, Austria  
Prof. Ph.D. Paolo GAJO, University of Florence, Italy  
Prof. Ph.D. Diego BEGALLI, University of Verona, Italy  
Prof. Ph.D. Alistair Mc CRACKEN, The Queen's University, Belfast, United Kingdom  
Ph.D. Hab. Stefan MANN, Research Station Agroscope, Federal Office for Economics, Tanikon, Switzerland  
Prof. Ph.D. Drago CVIJANOVIC, Institute of Agricultural Economics, Belgrade, Serbia  
Prof. Ph.D. Jonel SUBIC, Institute of Agricultural Economics, Belgrade, Serbia  
Prof. Ph.D. Nebojsa RALEVIC, University of Belgrade, Serbia  
Prof. Ph.D. Mamdouh Abbas HELMY, Modern University for Technology and Information, Cairo, Egypt  
Prof. Ph.D. Tarek FOUDA, Tanta University, Egypt  
Prof. Ph.D. Christopher Ogbonna EMEROLE, Abia State University, Uturu, Nigeria  
Prof. Ph.D. Veddi DEMIRCAN, Isparta University of Applied Sciences, Turkey  
Prof. Ph.D. Mevlüt GÜL, Isparta University of Applied Sciences, Turkey  
Acad. Prof. Ph.D. Hab. Pavel MOVILEANU, The Agricultural State University of Moldova, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Veronica PRISĂCARU, The Agricultural State University of Moldova, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Veronica MOVILEANU, The Agricultural State University of Moldova, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Hab. Mariana DOGA-MIRZAC, Moldova State University, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Zuzana PALKOVA, Slovak University of Agriculture, Nitra, Slovakia  
Associate Prof. Ph.D. Rashid SAEED, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan  
Ph.D. Cecilia ALEXANDRI, Institute for Agricultural Economics, Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Milian MERCE, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Cluj-Napoca, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Gheorghe MUREȘAN, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Cluj-Napoca, Romania  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Radu Lucian PÂNZARU, University of Craiova, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Stejarel BREZULEANU, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Iasi, Romania  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Gavrilă ȘTEFAN, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Iasi, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Cosile GOSA, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Banat Timisoara  
Prof. Ph.D. Nicoleta MATEOC-SÎRB, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Banat, Romania  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Tiberiu IANCIU, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Banat Timisoara  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Ioan BRAD, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Banat Timisoara  
Prof. Ph.D. Ioan Nicolae ALECU, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Manea DRĂGHICI, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Mihai BERCA, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Gina FÎNTÎNERU, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Romeo Catalin CRETU, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Cristiana TINĂSCHE, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Elena TOMA, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Ion DONA, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Elena STOIAN, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Adelaida Cristina IONTUS, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Ph.D. Daniela CRETU, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Silviu BECIU, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania  
Associate Professor Ph.D. Adrian TUREK-RAHOVEANU, University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania

**Publication Committee:**

Lecturer Eng. Teodora Popescu, Lecturer Ph.D. Mariana BURCEA, Lecturer Ph.D. Ionela VLAD,  
Lecturer Ph.D. Eugenia ALECU, Eng. Valentin SERBAN

The papers belong to the following research fields: economic engineering in agriculture, management, marketing and agri-food trade, rural economy, agricultural policies, accounting, financial analysis, finance, agrarian legislation, durable development, environment protection, tourism, agricultural extension and other connected areas.

## C O N T E N T

### **1.ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT ON EMPLOYEES' JOB SATISFACTION OF FORESTRY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF NIGERIA**

**Olaoluwa Ayodeji ADEBAYO..... 15**

### **2.GUESTS' PERCEPTION, EXPERIENCE AND SATISFACTION OF WAITING FOR HOTEL SERVICES IN ADO-EKITI, NIGERIA**

**Olaoluwa Ayodeji ADEBAYO, Olusola Emmanuel ADEDEJI..... 21**

### **3.ESTIMATION OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM FERTILIZER USE IN CORN, COTTON AND SOYBEAN PRODUCTION IN TURKEY**

**Sinasi AKDEMİR, Gursel KUSEK, H. Huseyin OZTURK..... 27**

### **4.ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM IRRIGATION APPLICATIONS AT DIFFERENT HEIGHTS IN CORN AND SUGARBEET PRODUCTION IN KUZOVA REGION OF TURKEY**

**Sinasi AKDEMİR, Gursel KUSEK, H. Huseyin OZTURK..... 33**

### **5.A TERRITORIAL APPROACH FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL AREAS. CASE OF BULGARIA**

**Svetlana ALEKSANDROVA-ZLATANSKA..... 39**

### **6.METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO STRUCTURING AGRI-FOOD POLICY IN THE NATIONAL FOOD SYSTEM OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

**Mikhail Aleksandrovich ANANIEV, Nadezhda Vasilievna SEDOVA,  
Stepan Petrovich BURLANKOV..... 49**

### **7.THE CONSERVATION OF PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE: THE PERSPECTIVE OF PRODUCERS WHO ARE TRADING IN SIBIU AGRI-FOOD MARKETS**

**Maria-Mihaela ANTOFIE..... 55**

### **8.THE MELLIFEROUS POTENTIAL OF THE FLORA IN THE GUȘTERIȚA LOCALITY, SIBIU COUNTY, ROMANIA**

**Iuliana ANTONIE..... 61**

**9.THE IMPACT OF BETTER GOVERNANCE ON FOREIGN PORTFOLIO INVESTMENT (FPI) IN AGRICULTURE**

Zeshan ANWAR, Farhan Zeb KHASKHELLY, Kausar ABBAS..... 67

**10.EFFECT OF WEEDING ON POPULATION OF FALL ARMYWORM (*SPODOPTERA FRUGIPERDA*) AND YIELD OF MAIZE (*ZEA MAYS* L.) IN UMUDIKE, ABIA STATE, NIGERIA**

Alozie ANYIM,Victor Munachimso UKONU,  
 Christopher Ogbonna EMEROLE..... 75

**11.THE EFFECT OF SWEET POTATO (*IPOMOEA BATATAS* L.) TUBER AND LEAVES *BRANGKASAN* SUBSTITUTION IN THE GROWTH PHASE LANDRACE BALI PIG (3-6 MONTHS AGE) RATION**

Ni Made Ayu Gemuh Rasa ASTITI, Bertha ATAMINA, Roostita L. BALIA,  
 Gemilang Lara UTAMA, Norman BILLI, Hendronoto A.W. LENGKEY..... 81

**12.ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTION IN RELATION TO THE DEMAND AND SUPPLY OF GRAPES IN ROMANIA**

Daniela Nicoleta BĂDAN, Ionut Laurentiu PETRE..... 87

**13.THE INCIDENCE OF APPLE "*VENTURIA INAEQUALIS*" IN TRADITIONAL ORCHARDS OF FÂNTÂNELE VILLAGE, SIBIU COUNTY, ROMANIA**

Ion BARBU, Maria-Mihaela ANTOFIE, Camelia SAVA..... 93

**14.TOOLS FOR ENSURING ECONOMIC SECURITY OF RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT**

Vitalii BOIKO, Petro OLISHCHUK..... 99

**15.THE BONITATION METHOD FOR ASSESSING THE FERTILITY OF THE CHERNOZEM**

Mariana BURCEA, Nicoleta OLTENACU..... 107

**16.THE DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL MUTATIONS IN RURAL AREAS OF TULCEA COUNTY, ROMANIA**

Rodica CHETROIU..... 113

**17.THE DRY MATTER ACCUMULATION IN THE WINTER WHEAT ONTOGENESIS ON THE CALCAREOUS CHERNOZEM UNDER MINERAL FERTILIZERS ACTION**

Vitalie CIOCHINA, Vasile LUNGU..... 119

**18.DIRECTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND INVESTMENT MECHANISM OF AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES USE**

Oksana Ivanivna DEBROT, Mykola Kharitonovich SHERSHUN,  
 Lyudmila Ivanivna SAKHARNATSKA,  
 Mariya Yaroslavivna VYSOCHANSKA..... 125

**19.ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF GREENHOUSE STRAWBERRY PRODUCTION: A CASE STUDY OF AYDIN PROVINCE, TURKEY**

Vecdi DEMIRCAN, Asli DALGIC, Tugba GULSEVER,  
 Bektas KADAKOGLU..... 133

**20.ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF ALMOND PRODUCTION: A CASE STUDY OF MUGLA PROVINCE, TURKEY**

Vecdi DEMIRCAN, Fatih YATAGAN, Asli DALGIC..... 141

**21.INTEGRATION OF COMPONENTS OF THE MECHANISM OF REALIZATION OF PRIORITIES OF SCIENTIFIC AND INTELLECTUAL POTENTIAL OF AGRI-FOOD COMPLEX**

Elena DERUNOVA..... 149

**22.INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AGRI-FOOD SYSTEM AS A DRIVER FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH IN THE REGION'S ECONOMY**

Elena DERUNOVA, Natal'ya KIREEVA, Olesya PRUSCHAK..... 165

**23.RESEARCH OF FACTORS OF COMPETITIVENESS OF ENTERPRISES OF THE AGRO-FOOD COMPLEX**

Elena DERUNOVA, Sergey ANDRYUSHCHENKO..... 175

**24.THE MANAGEMENT OF FORESTS SITUATED ON FIELDS SUSCEPTIBLE TO LANDSLIDES AND EROSION FROM THE SOUTHERN CARPATHIANS**

Lucian DINCĂ, Florin ACHIM..... 183

**25.PROSPECTS FOR IMPLEMENTING INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY IN ENTERPRISES WITHIN THE AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX**

Sergey Vladimirovich DOKHOLYAN, Rustam Alievich YALMAEV,  
 Marina Viktorovna POSTNOVA, Ilgizya Muzyakievna DOLGOVA,  
 Ramazan Abdulmuminovich NABIYEV..... 189

**26.GLOBALIZATION AND TOURISM. CASE STUDY - ROMANIA**

Daniela Marilena DOROBANȚU, Alina MĂRCUȚĂ, Liviu MĂRCUȚĂ..... 197

## THE EFFECT OF SWEET POTATO (*IPOMOEA BATATAS* L.) TUBER AND LEAVES BRANGKASAN SUBSTITUTION IN THE GROWTH PHASE LANDRACE BALI PIG (3-6 MONTHS AGE) RATION

Ni Made Ayu Gemuh Rasa ASTITI<sup>1</sup>, Bertha ATAMINA<sup>1</sup>, Roostita L. BALIA<sup>2</sup>,  
Gemilang Lara UTAMA<sup>3</sup>, Norman BILLI<sup>2</sup>, Hendronoto A.W. LENGKEY<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Warmadewa, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Animal Sciences, 24 Jl. Terompong, Denpasar 80235, Bali, Indonesia, Email: ayu-gemuh@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Padjadjaran, Faculty of Animal Husbandry,

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Padjadjaran, Faculty of Technology and Agricultural Sciences, Food Technology Department, Jl. Raya Bandung – Sumedang km 21, Sumedang 45363, Indonesia

*Corresponding author:* ayu-gemuh@gmail.com

### *Abstract*

*The high price of feed/ration is the biggest problem for farmers, so it requires a way to find quality but cheap feed ingredients, for example using brangkasan/stucker, which are sweet potato leaves and twigs and tubers as feed ingredients substitution for pigs, the protein and energy content is still quite high, but the economic value has not been realized by the farmers. This study aims to determine the effect of some percentage tubers and sweet potato brangkasan/stucker to substitute the concentrate, on the performance of landrace Bali pigs. The study used a Completely Randomized Design method (CRD) with 4 treatments consisting of : T-1 30% concentrate + 60% pollard + 10% sweet potato brangkasan/stucker as control, T-2: 10% concentrate + 60% pollard + 20% sweet potato tuber + 10% sweet potato leaves brangkasan/stucker, T-3: 10% concentrate + 50% pollard + 30% sweet potato tuber + 10% sweet potato leaves brangkasan/stucker and T-4: 10% concentrate + 40% pollard + 40% tuber + 10% sweet potato leaves brangkasan/stucker, which are repeated 5 times. Based on the results of the study, T-2 (giving 10% concentrate + 60% pollard + 20% sweet potato tuber + 10% sweet potato leaves brangkasan/stucker) causing an increase in body weight gain, final body weight and feed consumption, but decrease the feed conversion. Thus, it can be concluded that the substitution of sweet potato tubers and leaves brangkasan/stucker can be used as feed for growth phase landrace Bali pig.*

**Key words:** landrace Bali pig, sweet potato tuber and leaves brangkasan/stucker

### INTRODUCTION

In line with the increasing population and public awareness of the nutritional benefits of growth, the need for meat is also increase to fulfil community nutrition. This can be seen from the amount of meat consumption which has increased to 10.06 Kg per capita per year, and the production of livestock meat other than beef/buffalo, including pork in 2017 was 2,770,890 tons, decreased 0.92% compared to 2016, although in the last five years it increased by 4.50% [1]. To meet the needs of the community for animal protein from meat, it is necessary to increase meat production, to meet the needs of animal protein is to intensify pigs farming. Estimation output of Bali landrace pig, are between 45.5-70.49% [9].

Indonesia has a number of native pigs breed, such as the Bali, Nias, Papua and the Sumba pigs, which are kept by farmers in their original place. The government shows its concern to develop this original pigs research to find out the characteristics of native pigs and their possible contribution to produce with simple maintenance system [7].

Indonesia is the country that has the largest pig germplasm in the world, which is five out of eight species, but the native population is decreasing [8]. The meat colour and cooking loss of landrace Bali pig as variables, more better than the landrace Bali pig crossing [10]. Pigs, especially landrace Bali pigs, are very suitable to be developed in Bali because almost every family, especially in rural areas, raising pigs is only a side business, whose function is to use food scraps while providing



additional income for the family. Pig raising in Bali, especially in rural areas, has an important role to increase family income, and plays an important role in traditional and religious ceremonies [5]. Natural increase landrace Bali pig more better than Bali pig crossing [9].

*Brangkasan/stucker*, are leaves, stems and tubers of sweet potatoes, which are used as feed for pigs, because the protein and energy content is still quite high but the economic value has not been realized by farmers.

Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) have an important role as human food [6]. Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) have main nutritional material in tuber are carbohydrates (starches), proteins, fats and vitamins that are soluble in fat [4]. Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) are important carbohydrate-producing plants and also can be used as feed ingredients for livestock. The protein content of leaves is much higher than in the tuber, thus sweet potatoes leaves are very good as animal feed, and are one of the forages that can be given to pigs. This is because the crude fibre content in sweet potato leaves is relatively low at 17.3% [2]. The sweet potato tuber are rich in protein, also which cultivated in Poland [3]. It has a high nutritional values, about 50% higher than the potato. Furthermore, it is said that the protein content of the fresh matter tuber, is  $1.35\text{g } 100\text{g}^{-1}$ .

Tubers are main usable part of the sweet potato, although leaves can also be used. The leaves is 20.2% protein with a digestibility of 80.2%. Sweet potato are a good and inexpensive energy source because they contain high carbohydrates around 25-35 grams. Therefore, the use of non-economical tubers as pig feed can be used as feed ingredients, because energy is the main requirement for livestock to grow and develop. The biggest component of a ration is energy and for pigs by 70%. The ration in pigs is expected to have 16% protein content, and 12% fibre content with daily consumption of ration 0.9 to 2.0 Kg. Along with the increasingly concentrate as high quality of feed, it is endeavoured to find other foods that are easily obtained at lower prices. Sweet

potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) are important carbohydrate-producing plants and can be used as feed ingredients for livestock. Therefore, this study was conducted to examine the effect of sweet potatoes *brangkasan/stucker* tubers and leaves substitute in the rations on final body weight of growth stage landrace pigs with ages between 3-6 months.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Materials

This research used 12 female 3-month-old landrace Bali pigs with body weight range between 11.5 Kg - 13.5 Kg, purchased from farmers in the village of Tejakula-Buleleng. The cage used was 4 (four) pieces sized 3x2 x1 meter, and each cage consists of 3 bulkheads and each bulkhead is filled with one pig. The study lasted for 3 months, and feed was given morning and evening.

### Methods

This research use a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with four treatments and five replications, consisting of:

- T-1: 30% concentrate + 60% pollard + 10% sweet potato *brangkasan/stucker* as control
- T-2: 10% concentrate + 60% pollard + 20% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*,
- T-3: 10% concentrate + 50% pollard + 30% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*,
- T-4: 10% concentrate + 40% pollard + 40% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*.

The research variables studied initial body weight, weight gain, final body weight, feed consumption, and feed conversion.

The research was carried out at Central Laboratory, Department of Animal Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Warmadewa.

### Statistical Analysis

The study was carried out experimentally, used a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) of unidirectional patterns, with four treatments and five replications, consisting of:

- T-1: 30% concentrate + 60% pollard + 10% sweet potato *brangkasan/stucker* as control



b. T-2: 10% concentrate + 60% pollard + 20% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*,

c. T-3: 10% concentrate + 50% pollard + 30% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*,

d. T-4: 10% concentrate + 40% pollard + 40% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*.

The data obtained were then analyzed by variance, and if there were significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) between treatments, followed by the Least Significant Difference (LSD) (SPSS-21 software package) is carried out.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

*Initial body weight, weight gain, final body weight*

Based on the results of the study, obtained from initial body weight, weight gain, final body weight, as listed in Table 1.

Table 1. The Effect of giving *brangkasan/stucker* sweet potato tuber and leaves on Initial Body Weight, Weight Gain, and Final Body Weight

Variables	Treatments (Kg/head)				SEM <sup>2</sup>
	T-1	T-2	T-3	T-4	
Initial Body Weight	12.67 <sup>a</sup>	12.67 <sup>a</sup>	12.67 <sup>a</sup>	12.67 <sup>a</sup>	4.98
Body Weight Gain	43.93 <sup>a</sup>	45.16 <sup>b</sup>	35.83 <sup>c</sup>	25.16 <sup>d</sup>	8.89
Final Body Weight	56.60 <sup>a</sup>	57.83 <sup>a</sup>	48.50 <sup>b</sup>	37.83 <sup>c</sup>	4.98

Source: Own results in the laboratory.

Notes: 1. SEM: Standard Error of the treatment means

2. Values with the same letters on the same line show no significant difference ( $P > 0.05$ )

3. Different letters on the same line show significant differences ( $P < 0.01$ )

Table 1 shows that the use of 10% concentrate + 60% pollard + 20% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker* (T-2) on body weight gain was higher than T-1 (control), significantly different ( $P < 0.01$ ), because feed with the content of complex food substances will produce faster growth compared to ration which is reduced by one of its important substances. This is in accordance with the statement of Anggorodi (1979) which states

that the growth of livestock by the amount of food eaten, where the more the amount of food consumed, the higher the growth of livestock produced. Then T-3 and T-4 was lower than T-1 and T-2, very significantly different ( $P < 0.01$ ). This was due to the treatment that the sample was fed with lots of *brangkasan/stucker* sweet potato, consumed more crude fibre. An increase in the crude fibre content in the ration can reduce the metabolic energy (ME). High levels of crude fibre can cause disruption of other substances digestion. In Figure 1 which shows the effect of giving tubers and leaves *brangkasan* sweet potatoes (*Ipomoea batatas* L) to the body weight gain of landrace Bali pig.




Fig. 1. The landrace Bali pig weight gain in several treatments.

Source: Own results in the laboratory.

The final body weight of the T-1 treatment was lower when compared to the T-2 but was not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ); because T-2 had a low metabolic energy content, unless the material has a good energy source such as starch or carbohydrates. While T-3 and T-4 was lower than T-2, which was significantly different ( $P < 0.01$ ); because it has the same amount of energy and protein content but different coarse fibres will affect the amount of rations consumed. The low final body weight in T-3 and T-4, because the crude fibre content in the ration is too high which causes the chance of absorption of food substances decreases. Increased crude fibre in the ration, the consumption of feed increases, which will cause energy production to decrease.

Figure 2 shows the effect of giving sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L) tuber and leaves *brangkasan/stucker* towards final weight of landrace Bali pigs.




Fig.2. The effect of giving tuber and sweet potato *brangkasan/stucker* (*Ipomoea batatas* L) towards final weight of landrace Bali pigs.

Source: Own results in the laboratory.

From Figure 2, T-2 has higher final body weight, compared to other treatment, because T-2 has low metabolic energy content.

#### Feed Consumption and Feed Conversion

In Table 2, one may see the results for Feed Consumption and Feed Conversion

Table 2. The Averages data of Feed Consumption and Feed Conversion

Variables	Treatments				SEM
	T-1	T-2	T-3	T-4	
Feed Consumption (Kg/head)	122.50 <sup>a</sup>	120.42 <sup>a</sup>	111.00 <sup>b</sup>	102.08 <sup>c</sup>	4.40
Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR)	2.81 <sup>a</sup>	2.68 <sup>a</sup>	3.14 <sup>a</sup>	3.95 <sup>a</sup>	1.85

Source: Own results in the laboratory.

Notes:

1. SEM: Standard Error of The Treatment Means
2. Values with the same letters on the same line show no significant difference ( $P > 0.05$ )
3. Different letters on the same line show significant differences ( $P < 0.01$ )

Table 2 shows that the ration consumption in treatment T-1 is higher than treatment T-2 but statistically is not significant different ( $P > 0.05$ ). This is because in treatment T-2 gets rations with higher energy and protein content (low crude fibre) so will growth faster, and the ration consumption lesser if rations are consumed with good metabolize energy. Energy and protein consumed are related to the tissue formed. Whereas in treatment T-3 and T-4 lower than T-2, was statistically very significantly different ( $P < 0.01$ ); because the food consumed has the same energy and protein content, but it has different feed crude fibre content, so it is clear that the consumption of rations in T-2 treatment is higher than the treatment of T-3 and T-4

treatments, because the increase in crude fibre content in T-3 and T-4 treatments, can reduce digestibility. In addition, the increase in crude fibre content in the ration can lead more efficient use of metabolic energy caused by transferring the portion of the net fraction of muscle energy needed to push the remaining food along the digestive tract.

Figure 3 shows the effect of giving tubers and leaves *brangkasan/stucker* propagate to feed consumption in landrace Bali pigs.




Fig. 3. Feed Consumption of landrace Bali pig in various treatments

Source: Own results in the laboratory.

T-2, T-3 and T-4 were lesser consumed by the pig, compared to T-1. Even the consumption were less but the growth of the pig was not significant different with T-1.

#### Feed conversion

Feed conversion is one indicator that can provide an illustration of the level of efficiency of ration used, the lower the ration conversion value, the better the efficiency of the ration used. T-2 (10% concentrate + 60% pollard + 20% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*) gave the best feed conversion.

Although the FCR produced was not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ), there was a tendency for pigs that received T-2 treatment, which had the ability to more efficiently convert food ingredients into meat or in other words the amount the food needed to increase one-unit weight is smaller than that of pigs giving the treatment T-1.

In the treatment of T-3 and T-4 the ration conversion was low so that body weight gain was also low as a result of the pigs being inefficient in utilizing rations which caused low ration conversion. An increase in crude fibre content in the ration causes the

opportunity to absorb food substances for growth to decline.




Fig. 4. Feed Conversion on landrace Bali pig for each treatment

Source: Own results in the laboratory.

Then it is presented in Figure 4 about the effect of giving tuber and leaves sweet potato *brangkasan/stucker* to the conversion of landrace Bali pig rations. The T-2 gave the best feed conversion for growth phase landrace Bali pig, that giving tuber and leaves sweet potato *brangkasan/stucker*.

## CONCLUSIONS

From the results of the study, it can be concluded that giving 10% concentrate + 60% pollard + 20% sweet potato tuber + 10% leaves *brangkasan/stucker*, can increase weight gain, final body weight, and ration conversion but decrease the ration consumption compared to the control ration. It means that giving *brangkasan/stucker* tuber and leaves sweet potatoes (*Ipomoea batatas* L) as the concentrate substitution, can be used to growth phase landrace Bali pig ration.

## REFERENCES

[1]Direktorat Jenderal Peternakan dan Kesehatan Hewan, 2018, Buku Statistik Peternakan dan Kesehatan Hewan. (Directorate General of Animal Husbandry and Animal Health of the Republic of Indonesia. Book of Animal Husbandry and Animal Health Statistics Year 2018). Jakarta.  
[2]Koentjoko, Soebarinoto, 1994, Ubi Jalar Untuk Pakan Ternak. Risalah Seminar Penerapan Teknologi Produksi dan Pasca Panen Ubi Jalar Mendukung Agroindustri. Balai Penelitian Tanaman Pangan Malang. Rudak Penelitian dan Pengembangan Tanaman Pangan. Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pertanian (Sweet potatoes for Animal Feed. Minutes of Seminar on Sweet potatoes: the Application of Production Technology and Post Harvest, Supporting the Agro-

industry. Food Crop Research Institute Malang. Rudak Food Crop Research and Development. Agricultural Research and Development Agency). Malang, Indonesia. (in Indonesian).

[3]Krochmal-Marczak, B., Sawicka, B., Supski, J., Cebulak, T., Paradowska, K., 2014, Nutrition value of the sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* (L.) Lam) cultivated in south-eastern Polish conditions. International Journal of Agronomy and Agricultural Research (IJAAAR). Vol. 4(4):169-178.

[4]Maloney, K., Truong Van Den, Allen, J.C., 2012, Chemical Optimization of Protein Extraction from Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) Peel. Journal of Food Science 77:306-312.

[5]Masudana, I. W., 1983, Peternakan Babi di Daerah Bali, Usaha-usaha Perbaikan Melalui Pejantan (Pig Farming in Bali:Efforts Improvements through Boars Selection). Dinas Peternakan Propinsi Bali (Bali Provincial Animal Husbandry Service). (in Indonesian).

[6]Ofori, G., Oduro, I, Elis, W.O., Dapaah, H., 2005, Assessment of vitamin A content and sensory attributes of new sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) genotypes in Ghana. African Journal of Food Science 3:184-192.

[7]Siagian, P.H., 2009, Produksi Babi di Indonesia (Pig Production in Indonesia). pp. 175-186.(in Indonesian)

[8]Soewandi, B.D., Talib, C., 2015, Perkembangan Babi Lokal di Indonesia (Local Pig Development in Indonesia). Wartazoa, Vol. 25 (1). (in Indonesian).

[9]Soewandi, B. D. P., Sumadi, Hartatik, T., 2013, Estimasi Output Babi di Kabupaten Tabanan, Provinsi Bali. (Output estimation of Pig in Tabanan Regency, Bali Province). Buletin Peternakan, Vol. 37(3) : 165-172. (in Indonesian).

[10]Sriyani, N.L.P., Artiningsih R. N. P., Lindawati, S. A., Oka A. A., 2015, Studi Perbandingan Kualitas Fisik Daging Babi Bali dengan Babi Landrace Persilangan yang dipotong di RPH Tradisional (Comparative Study Physical Quality of Bali Pig and Landrace Crosses Meat, that slaughtered at Traditional Slaughterhouse System), Majalah Ilmiah Peternakan (Animal Husbandry Journal). Vol. 18 (1). (in Indonesian).





# SERIES “MANAGEMENT, ECONOMIC ENGINEERING IN AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT”

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13%  
SIMILARITY INDEX

9%  
INTERNET SOURCES

9%  
PUBLICATIONS

12%  
STUDENT PAPERS

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

9%  
★ [www.agricultureforlife.usamv.ro](http://www.agricultureforlife.usamv.ro)  
Internet Source

Exclude quotes      On  
Exclude bibliography      On

Exclude matches      < 1%

# SERIES “MANAGEMENT, ECONOMIC ENGINEERING IN AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT”

## GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

**Instructor**

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11